

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,457	07/14/2003	Rajan A. Jaisinghani	P56907	3861
75	590 12/07/2005		EXAMINER	
Robert E. Bushnell			CHIESA, RICHARD L	
Suite 300 1522 K Street, N.W.			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20005			1724	
			DATE MAIL ED: 12/07/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*			UX				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/618,457	JAISINGHANI, RAJAN A.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Richard L. Chiesa	1724					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timediately and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	J. nely filed the mailing date of this of the mailing date of this of the control of the contr					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Oc	ctober 2005.						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	63 O.G. 213.	•				
Disposition of Claims							
4)	vn from consideration. 7 <u>-111,114,115 and 124</u> is/are allo 5,106,116-119,125-128,130-133,1 0-123,129,134 and 140 is/are ob	135-139 and 141	is/are rejected.				
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 December 2003</u> is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	re: a) \square accepted or b) \square objected or by accepted or by acceptance. See son is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P		O-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

Application/Control Number: 10/618,457 Page 2

Art Unit: 1724

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on October 17, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 43 is objected to because the phrase "said thickness" on the second line of claim
43 should apparently be changed to --a thickness--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 42-45, 48, 49, 51-53, 56, 78-80, 83-85, 125-127, 131-133, and 136-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

Application/Control Number: 10/618,457

Art Unit: 1724

obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,999,964 to Carr. Carr (note Figures 1-5, and col. 3, line 19 to col. 4, line 41) discloses an electrically enhanced filter apparatus and method with a porous replaceable filter medium positioned between perforated grids 26 and 28 forming pockets between arms of the filter assembly as claimed (35 USC 102b). It would appear that Carr may not explicitly state that the perforated grids are electrically conducting. However, Carr (note col. 4, lines 11-14) does disclose that the electrically conductive bus bar connects the charged perforated grid to a high magnitude DC voltage which indicates that the perforated grids of Carr are electrically conducting in virtually the same manner disclosed and shown by applicant. Consequently, it is inherent or at least would have been readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (35 USC 103a) that Carr's perforated grids are electrically conductive.

Claims 42-45, 47-49, 51-54, 56-63, 78-80, 83-85, 106, 116-119, 125-128, 130-133, 135-139, and 141 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,999,964 to Carr in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,497,754 to Joannou. Carr, as described above in paragraph 5, discloses an electrically enhanced filter apparatus and process substantially as claimed. It would appear that Carr may not explicitly state that the grids are electrically conducting. Furthermore, Carr apparently does not disclose the presence of conductive print or pleats in the filter medium arms. However, Joannou (note Figures 1-6) teaches the well-known use of conductive grids 5, 10 including conductive graphite printing (note col. 4, lines 5-17) and a pleated filter medium 15 for the purpose of ensuring maximum electric charging and particle collection area (note Abstract; col. 2, lines 20-64, and col. 4, lines 27-65). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ conductive grids with

Application/Control Number: 10/618,457

Art Unit: 1724

conductive graphite print and a pleated filter medium in the Carr electrically enhanced filter

Page 4

apparatus and process in order to improve electric charging and particle capture as taught by

Joannou.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-24, 36-41, 64-77, 94-101, 103-105, 107-111, 114, 115, and 124 are allowed. 7.

8. Claims 46, 50, 55, 81, 82, 86, 87, 102, 112, 113, 120-123, 129, 134, and 140 are objected

to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on October 17, 2005 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Most of applicant's comments now appear to be irrelevant due to the new

grounds of rejection. However, it is important for applicant to understand that Carr discloses the

filter, arms, and pockets. Joannou has merely been relied upon to explicitly teach conductive

grids, graphite printing, and filter medium pleats. Employing these apparently minor

modifications to the Carr filter device and process would clearly not destroy the basic operation

of the Carr filter system as argued by the applicant.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard L. Chiesa whose telephone number is (571) 272-1154.

Application/Control Number: 10/618,457

Art Unit: 1724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane S. Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166.

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1700 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Facsimile correspondence must be transmitted through (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard L. Chiesa December 2, 2005

> RICHARD L. CHIESA PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1724

Richard L. Chiesa

Dec. 2, 2005